



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,206	09/09/2003	Chae-Whan Lim	45682	9142
7590	07/02/2007		EXAMINER	
Peter L. Kendall Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			LIEW, ALEX KOK SOON	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,206	LIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alex Liew	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-12,14-20,23-25,28 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6,13,21,22,26,27,32 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

1. The amendment filed on April 25, 2007 is entered and made of record.
2. The applicant argues in the reply that the foreign priority date of the current application is earlier than the reference US filing date of Iwayama (US pub no 2004/0161151), which does not qualify as a prior art. The examiner would like to point out that an English translation of the application is required in order to overcome the Iwayama reference (see Title 37 § 1.55 (4)). With regards to Feng (US pub no 2004/0120598), see the arguments for Iwayama.

The examiner will repeat the same rejection.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 6, 13, 21, 22, 26, 27, 32 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With regards to claim 6, the examiner's search cannot find any suggestions disclosing a speech recognizer for generating an input signal to select a save item in the storage mode in combination with the rest of the limitation of claim 6 and claims 1 and 5. In addition, Pearson (US pat no 6,705,872) discloses an input saving command using speech recognition used in the communication art (see col. 16 lines 15 – 20), but not in pattern recognition.

With regards to claims 13, 22, 27 and 32, see the rationale for claim 6.

With regards to claim 21, the examiner's search does not show any applicable prior art and / or suggestions disclosing displaying a handwritten character recognition window when correction character data is not contained in the displayed candidate characters in combination with its intervening claims and the rest of the limitations of claim 21.

With regards to claims 26 and 33, see the rationale for claim 21.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14 – 16, 19, 20, 23 – 25, 28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen (US pat no 5,465,304) in view of Iwayama (US pub 2004/0161151) and Berkekey (US pat no 3,701,972).

With regards to claim 1, Cullen discloses an apparatus for recognizing a character image from a document, comprising

a pre-processor for analyzing pixels of a document image in the recognition mode, classifying the document image into at least one Character Block (CB) and at

least one Background Block (BB) on the basis of a result of the analysis, binarizing pixels of the BB and generating a pre-processed document image (see fig 2a and 2b – 220 is one character block, the background block are the pixels which are not 'black' or not dark in color, see col. 7 lines 46 – 53 – the term compression used in the reference is read as binarizing),

a character recognizer for recognizing the pre-processed document image and converting the recognized pre-processed document image into character data (see col. 4 lines 37 – 57 – after segmentation is done, which is the creation of individual blocks, character recognition is perform on each block, transforming those image data into character data)

a database for storing the recognized character data in the storage mode (it is inherent to have a database of registered character templates when recognizing any type of patterns, if there is no database storing the reference patterns then pattern recognition cannot be done)

a display unit for displaying the document image (see fig 1 – the computer monitor shows an image of the scanned document).

But does not discloses recognition error processor part for correcting or replacing character image. Cullen discloses a character recognition part, but does not take a step further to find possible candidates characters. Iwayama discloses

a recognition error processor for correcting or replacing erroneously recognized character data selected by the input unit with character data output by the input unit in the correction mode (see fig 6 – the handwritten characters are written on the right side

of the panel are being recognized, the results from recognition are displayed on the left side of the display panel, candidates character symbols are displayed to the user, then the user can select the correct character symbol, the selected candidate symbol will replace the present symbol shown beneath 'Address') and

a display unit for displaying character data generated during recognition mode (see fig 6 – the character symbols beneath 'Address' are displayed to the user). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include recognition error processor part for correcting or replacing character image because to allow the user to select the correct character that belongs at a predetermined position (eg. 'famll' the user is able to replace the 'l' with an 'i'), to prevent errors in the output of the character recognition.

Iwayama does not disclose an input unit for generating commands for a recognition mode, a correction mode and a storage mode. Berkekey discloses an input unit for generating commands for a recognition mode, a correction mode and a storage mode (see col. 129 lines 66 – 67 to col. 130 lines 1 – 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a step of generating commands because to allow the user to manually keep repeating the recognition step to obtain the correct character or word to store into the database of reference patterns, to prevent any incorrect registration, so the database will not be corrupted with incorrect data.

With regards to claim 2, Cullen discloses an apparatus as set forth in claim 1, wherein the pre-processor comprises:

    a skew correction part for classifying stripes having a present length or above from the document image, calculating direction angles of the classified stripes, measuring a skew of an object, deciding a skew angle corresponding to the measured skew and correcting the object skew (see col. 6 lines 31 – 41 – the skew angle of a rectangle is calculated and then based on the calculated skew angle, appropriate correction is performed),

    an Region Of Contents (ROC) extension part for classifying the document image in which the object skew is corrected into CBs and BBs, searching for positions of the CBs to extract the CBs and extending a size of an image of the extracted CBs to a size of an input image (see col. 6 lines 42 – 57 – after skew correction the system reclassifies the character and extends the length of the block is they are connected) and

    an image binarization part for comparing pixels of the CBs for the document image with a pixel threshold value, binarizing the pixels of the CBs into pixels having brightness values for character and background pixels, and binarizing pixel of the BBs into pixels having a brightness value for background pixels (see col. 7 lines 46 – 53 – the term compression used in the reference is read as binarizing, the dark pixels belongs to the character and white or bright pixels belongs to the background).

With regards to claim 5, Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails

to disclose using a camera to take image of document. Cullen discloses an apparatus as set forth in claim 1, further comprising a scanner for detecting the document and generating the document image (see fig 1 – 101 – the scanner). It is very well known to take images with a camera or a digital camera. One skill in the art would use a camera over a scanner is because a camera only needs to take snap shots of the document, while a scanner takes time to scan an entire document, so to save time.

With regards to claim 7, Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 5 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails to disclose a correction mode. Iwayama discloses an apparatus as set forth in claim 5, wherein the character recognizer comprises a handwritten character recognizer for recognizing a received handwritten character image in the correction mode and converting the recognized handwritten character image into correction character data necessary for correcting the erroneously recognized character data (see fig 6 – the received handwritten character is on the right side of the display screen and the recognized character is on the left side of the display screen, when the user see the recognized character is not correct the user will replace or correct the character shown from the candidate character displayed below the recognized character, the character in the middle). See the motivation provided in claim 1.

With regards to claim 9, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1. In addition, Cullen discloses a display unit for displaying an input document image (see fig 1); Iwayama

Art Unit: 2624

discloses a display area for displaying saved items (see fig 6 – left side of the screen the recognized characters are stored temporary in buffer memory) and display area for displaying character data of a selected save items (see fig 6 – the candidates characters are also stored temporary in buffer memory in order to display it on the screen); Berkeley discloses an input command for recognition mode, correction mode and storage mode, but does not discloses showing all of the mentioned items displayed all at once. To have a set of displays displaying the above mentioned items are a matter of design of how to show the input information and results shown to the user. One would desired to show the input and output results to the user all at once because to allow the user to correct unrecognized or miss-recognized characters in the recognition process to improve readability of the character data when character data is transfer to a word processor top further edit the details of the input document.

With regards to claim 10, see the rationale and rejection for claim 2.

With regards to claim 14, see the rationale and rejection for claim 7.

With regards to claim 15, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1.

With regards to claim 16, see the rationale and rejection for claim 2.

With regards to claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 30 and 31, see the rationale and rejection for claim 7. In addition, in Iwayama, shown in left screen of figure 6, when the incorrect recognized character is display on the panel beneath 'Address,' the user is allow to select from a set of candidates characters.

With regards to claim 23, see the rationale and rejection for claim 1 and the motivation provided in claim 9 in regards to the multiple displays. In addition, it is well known in the art to use the 'SAVE' command to stored data in the hard drive or storage medium. One skill in the art will use this save command because to permanently store important data in a storage medium, so the user can refer to this data later in time.

With regards to claim 28, see the rationale and rejection for claims 1, 9 and 23. In addition, it is well known in the art to use an image card bearing the person name as a form of identification for accessing a terminal or facility.

3. Claims 3, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen (US pat no 5,465,304) in view of Iwayama (US pub 2004/0161151) and Berkekey (US pat no 3,701,972) as applied to claim 2 further in view of Feng (US pub no 2004/0120598).

With regards to claim 3, Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 2 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails

to disclose blurred-image detection. Cullen uses a scanner to scan in the document for processing and Feng shows that digital images may be processed or manipulated to cause defects and image blur (see paragraph 2). Feng discloses a blurred-image detection part for any input digital image by calculating an average energy ratio for the input image, comparing the average energy ratio with a predetermined threshold value and determining whether the input image is blurred according to a result of the comparison (see paragraph 25 – the edge DCT coefficients of the blurred image are lower than the edge DCT coefficients of the non-blurred image, the threshold are the value between those set of coefficients). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include image blur detection step because to allow the system to take appropriate algorithm to correct the blur in the image to minimize character recognition errors.

With regards to claims 11 and 17, see the rationale and rejection for claim 3.

4. Claims 4, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen (US pat no 5,465,304) in view of Iwayama (US pub 2004/0161151) and Berkekey (US pat no 3,701,972) as applied to claim 2 further in view of Komori (US pat no 4,180,798).

With regards to claim 4, Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 2 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails

to disclose noise reduction step. Komori discloses a pre-processing unit for reducing noise of the character image (see col. 1 lines 24 – 29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include noise reduction part because to improve the quality of the character image to minimize character recognition errors.

With regards to claims 12 and 18, see the rationale and rejection for claim 4.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen (US pat no 5,465,304) in view of Iwayama (US pub 2004/0161151) and Berkekey (US pat no 3,701,972) as applied to claim 5 further in view of Kaplan (US pat no 4,799,077).

Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 2 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails to disclose camera adjusting a focal distance and exposure time. Kaplan discloses a step to adjust the camera's focal distance and exposure time (see col. 2 lines 36 – 39 and fig 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include camera adjusting a focal distance and exposure time because to avoid having the capture image to blur, so there is no need of image analysis and processing to correct the blur in the image to save time.

5. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen (US pat no 5,465,304) in view of Iwayama (US pub 2004/0161151) and Berkekey (US pat no 3,701,972) as applied to claim 28 further in view of Iwase (US pub no 2002/0165803).

Cullen discloses all of the claim elements / features as discussed above in rejection for claim 2 and incorporated herein by reference, but fails to disclose saving personal information of the user. Iwase stores personal information of the user using a mobile phone (see fig 6). One skill in the art would store personal information in his or her mobile phone because in case the user may forget its own information and occasion arise needing the information.

### ***Conclusion***

**This action is made final.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shorten statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire three months from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within two months of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the three-month shorten statutory period, then the shorten statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory


action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than six months from the mailing date of the final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alex Liew whose telephone number is (571)272-8623. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM - 7:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on (571)272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alex Liew  
AU2624  
6/18/07



JOSEPH MANCUSO  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER